

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 12 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 9 and 21-26 are pending in the application. Claims 15-20 have been cancelled. Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to clarify minor typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

A number of claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,600,775 issued to King et al. that has been discussed in detail in previous responses. In the most current Response to Arguments, it is stated that the Applicants' arguments filed May 19, 2006 are not persuasive in that, "the applicant states in the disclosure that the annotations are computer readable op-code (page 2, lines 19 and 20, page 3 lines 30-33 and page 4, lines 14-16)," and furthermore that, "the editing of the annotation data would be a permanent modification to the video frame information where in the video frame information is the op-code read by the system." The rejections are respectfully traversed. Claim 1 is recited below:

A video presentation tool kit for creating an annotated video presentation formed of a number of linearly associated video frames each having associated video frame information; comprising:

a user activated designation tool for designating at least a portion of at least one of a number of video frames;

an annotator tool for annotating the designated video frame portion by permanently modifying the video frame information corresponding to the designated video frame portion; and

an authoring tool arranged to provide additional effects to enhance the video content modifications of the designated video frame portion.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertion that the "video frame information is the op-code read by the system" is without merit. The Applicants' contend that op-code is simply a set of computer readable instructions executed by a processor to modify the original video frame information, examples of which are shown on pages 10-15. For example, a set of Timer Op-Codes includes a HALT op-code that merely indicates to the processor an endpoint of a commentary, which has nothing whatsoever to do with video frame information.

Further examples include various Presentation Op-Codes that instruct the processor how to permanently modify selected video frame information. By way of example, the SET ZOOM op-code sets the zoom parameter associated with a particular frame or scene of the video title. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that op-code is not video frame information.

Furthermore, page 4, lines 14-16 of the specification recite, "As used herein, the term 'commentary' refers to a byte stream of op-codes and associated parameters executable to display all or portions of a video title(s) with additional enhancements." Accordingly, the commentary is a set of instructions to the processor indicating how to permanently modify the video data and is **NOT** the same as the modified video data itself. In this way, the video frame information is permanently modified by the execution of the commentary and associated op-codes, in contrast to the King reference, which specifically states that the original video is not modified: "Full motion digital video frames, or other indexed data structures, are annotated with text, graphics, and digital audio without modifications to the original video information. The video and annotations are stored separately (See Abstract)."

Since King does not anticipate nor reasonably suggest the invention as recited in claim 1, the Applicants' respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 15 and 21 teach a system and a method, respectively, that recite limitations essentially the same in scope as independent claim 1 and are, therefore, respectfully submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1.

All dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 15 and 21 and are, therefore, also respectfully submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons stated for claims 1, 15 and 21 above.

A number of other claims stand rejected as being obvious under King in view of Official Notice (at page 5, second paragraph) and as being obvious under King in view of U.S. Patent

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER


SEP 12 2006

6,507,696 issued to Chung, as well as King in view of Chung and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,375 issued to Jain. It is the Applicants' belief that none of the cited references (nor the Official Notice) add to King with regard to the claimed limitations of the invention. Therefore, the Applicants' believe that the secondary references fail to cure the fundamental deficiencies of King and respectfully request that the obviousness type rejections thereof be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300